

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 299

HE 025 084

AUTHOR Chronsiter, Jay L.; And Others
TITLE Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: Current Status, Future Prospects, Remaining Research Questions. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Boston, MA, October 31-November 3, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Differences; *College Faculty; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Nontenured Faculty; Questionnaires; Sex Differences; Teacher Attitudes; *Tenured Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

This study used available data to develop an initial profile of non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty in comparison to their non-tenured but tenure track (TT) counterparts and to develop questions to guide future study of this group. Using data from a 1989 survey of the professorate conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the study analyzed the responses of 832 untenured but tenure-track faculty and 183 non-tenure-track faculty all teaching full-time at four-year colleges. Findings suggest that academic life without tenure is characterized by stress and uncertainty for both groups. NTT professors were generally older, less mobile professionally and employed at primarily teaching-oriented institutions. NTT faculty were less actively involved in scholarship though many attempted to maintain a research agenda. Women comprised a larger proportion of the NTT group; the interrupted career patterns common among women and other factors may account for this difference. NTT faculty also expressed less optimism about their prospects for future career advancement in higher education. Includes 7 tables and 15 references. (JB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED339299

FULL-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY:

CURRENT STATUS, FUTURE PROSPECTS, REMAINING RESEARCH QUESTIONS

by

Jay L. Chronister, University of Virginia
Roger G. Baldwin, National Science Foundation
Theresa G. Bailey, Liberty University

Presented at the annual meeting of the
Association for the Study of Higher Education

Boston, Massachusetts

October, 1991

Source of Data: The Carnegie Foundation for
the Advancement of Teaching, 1989 National
Survey of Faculty

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jay L. Chronister

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✕ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

□ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

HE 025 084



Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Park Plaza Hotel & Towers in Boston, Massachusetts, October 31-November 3, 1991. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

FULL-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY:

CURRENT STATUS, FUTURE PROSPECTS, REMAINING RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The Problem

This study concerns non-tenure-track faculty, a growing segment of the academic profession. A variety of recent books and reports (Astin, Korn, and Dey, 1991; Bowen and Schuster, 1986; Boyer, 1989; Bowen and Sosa, 1989; Lynton and Elman, 1987; U.S. Department of Education, 1990) has focused attention on the condition of the American academic profession. Concern for the overall well-being of the nation's educational system has stimulated these studies of faculty issues. Higher education is a labor intensive enterprise. Hence, the quality and vitality of the faculty in colleges and universities directly affects the health of American higher education. While the nation attempts to reform and reinvigorate its educational system, it must also take the pulse of the personnel on the front lines of higher education, college and university professors.

Several of the reports on the professoriate (Bowen and Schuster, 1986; Bowen and Sosa, 1989; Lynton and Elman, 1987) discuss the difficulties many higher learning institutions are likely to encounter as they try to maintain faculties qualified to meet the education demands of the 21st century. In response to staffing challenges, many higher education institutions with tenure systems have chosen to hire more non-tenure-track (NTT) professors. Many persons hired in this status work full-time and perform most

of the same functions as other faculty members. To an outside observer, their role is often indistinguishable from that of a person hired on the tenure-track. However, the non-tenure-track appointment comes with the explicit understanding that it is only temporary. Eventually, the person hired in this capacity will be required to leave the institution and seek employment elsewhere, in or out of higher education.

Colleges and universities derive substantial benefits from hiring non-tenure-track faculty. Temporary professors enable an institution to preserve flexibility in a period of financial constraint; they help to stretch limited resources; and they make it easier for colleges to respond rapidly to shifting market forces and enrollment patterns.

However, the consequences of hiring faculty off the tenure track have not been examined systematically. The major national reports on faculty give sparse attention to the non-tenure-track faculty issue. No reports look at the long-term impact of large numbers of non-tenure-track faculty on the operations, quality, or sense of community at higher education institutions. Likewise, the available reports do not address, in any depth, the impact of non-tenure-track status on individual professors. The relationship of temporary appointments to professors' performance, morale, and career development is unclear at present due to the lack of relevant data.

As the number of non-tenure-track faculty grows throughout higher education (El-Khawas, 1989; AAUP, 1986), it is critical

that researchers take a close look at this increasingly important segment of the professoriate. Empirical findings on non-tenure-track faculty can inform faculty hiring and staffing practices, personnel policies, and faculty development strategies.

Objectives of the Study

The research reported in this paper is exploratory in nature. Due to the limited amount of prior study specifically on non-tenure-track faculty, the investigators lacked a body of knowledge on which to build an in-depth research project. Essentially, our goal was to use available data to develop an initial profile of non-tenure-track faculty and to develop questions that could guide future study of this increasingly significant component of the American professoriate.

Available models of career development and prior research on faculty careers do, however, provide a framework for studying this special group of faculty. The peripheral and probationary nature of non-tenure-track appointments, to some extent, parallels the experience of junior professors early in an academic career. Research on faculty career development (Baldwin, 1979; Baldwin and Blackburn, 1981; see Finkelstein, 1984) suggests that the early career years are a challenging time characterized by rapid learning, competing responsibilities, and considerable stress and strain. Lack of long-term career security is, likewise, a common concern early in academic life that may persist among academics who are not eligible to achieve tenure. Given the similarities in their experiences, it seems

logical that non-tenure-track faculty would have attributes and concerns in common with tenure-track faculty in the early years of academic life.

Career development theories (Hall, 1976; Hall and Nougaim, 1968; Super, 1986) suggest that the early stages of professional life are closely related to success at advanced stages of a career. If this assumption is correct, the experiences of temporary and probationary faculty are likely to influence their subsequent careers in the academic profession. If their initial experience is positive, non-tenured faculty most likely will have productive careers and advance to the senior ranks of their profession. However, if the early career is marked by many negative experiences, untenured faculty may never achieve their full potential within higher education, or they may eventually leave the profession for more attractive professional opportunities.

In their three part model of the academic career, Light, Marsden, and Corl (1972) divide the career into disciplinary, institutional, and external strands. Although these strands overlap throughout academic life, the disciplinary and institutional elements are most prominent in the lives of junior, less established faculty. To advance in the disciplinary strand, a faculty member must contribute to her or his discipline by staying current, conducting research, publishing, and participating in professional associations. In this way, the individual wins recognition from senior colleagues and earns

promotion to higher ranks. The institutional strand is also critically important to early career development and achievement. The institutional context of a faculty career provides the colleague climate, resources, and recognition essential to career advancement. If circumstances in either one of these strands are negative, they can inhibit faculty performance and the evolution of a successful academic career. Based on the conceptual underpinnings reviewed above, it seems clear that an exploratory study of non-tenure-track faculty should examine both the disciplinary and institutional aspects of their work lives in order to assess the well-being and future prospects of this important faculty group.

Research Questions

The overarching goal of the study was to assess the condition of non-tenure-track faculty in American higher education in comparison to the condition of their non-tenured but tenure-track counterparts. Relevant theory and research on career development raised the following specific research questions:

1. What is the primary career orientation of non-tenure-track faculty (i.e., teaching vs. research, discipline vs. institution, local vs. cosmopolitan) and how does this orientation compare with the orientation of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty?
2. How do non-tenure-track and tenure-track faculty differ in their perceptions of their work environment (ie. participation

in institutional governance, the intellectual environment, and the sense of community, etc.)?

3. How do non-tenure-track and tenure-track faculty differ in their perceptions of their career future?

Data Source

The data utilized in this study were generated by the 1989 survey of the professoriate conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. A two-stage, stratified, random sample design was used to select college and university faculty for inclusion in the survey. The first stage involved selecting 306 four-year and two-year institutions from the Carnegie Foundation data bank. The second stage involved the random selection of 9,996 faculty from those institutions with the faculty equally distributed among the nine classifications of institutions chosen for the survey. A total of 5,450 faculty responded to the survey for a response rate of 54.5 percent.

From the resulting data set, this study analyzed the responses of 832 untenured but tenure-track faculty and 183 non-tenure-track faculty. The faculty included in this analysis were all full-time employees at four-year colleges and universities on at least nine month contracts. Non-tenure-track respondents chosen for analysis were those who indicated their appointments were not on tenure-track and who were without the guarantee of a continuous contract.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study excludes 2-year college faculty because the researchers desired to limit this phase of the study to 4-year

college personnel. Two-year college personnel will be the object of a later analysis.

2. Whereas the Carnegie study of the condition of the professoriate weighted its data for analysis, this analysis deals with unweighted data. There is no attempt in this exploratory study to generalize the results to the broader faculty population who may have similar types of appointments.

Data Analysis

This exploratory study utilizes data from selected questions included in the 1989 Carnegie Foundation faculty survey. The initial data analysis relied primarily on descriptive statistics in order to develop profiles of the two groups of faculty on selected items.

Subsequently, multivariate analyses were conducted. Multiple regression techniques were utilized to determine and describe the relationship between the dependent variable, tenure-track status, and the selected independent variables. Discriminant analysis was utilized to determine whether the non-tenured but tenure-track cohort of faculty differed from the non-tenure-track cohort on the variables chosen for study. Twenty-seven items were chosen from the Carnegie Foundation survey form as the independent variables. The 27 items are listed in Table 1.

(insert Table 1 about here)

Findings

The initial analysis of the characteristics of the two cohorts

of faculty showed that the average age of the non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty was 43 and that slightly more than half (50.8%) were women, whereas the average age of the tenure-eligible (TT) faculty was 41 and slightly more than one-third (35.7%) of them were women.

An additional factor reviewed was the type of institution at which the faculty were employed. For the purpose of this analysis we collapsed the eight Carnegie classifications of four year institutions into four broad types: Research Universities, Doctorate Granting Universities, Comprehensive Colleges and Universities, and Liberal Arts Colleges. As shown in Table 1 tenure-track (TT) faculty are relatively evenly distributed across the four types of institutions, while non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty are more prone to be found in the more teaching-oriented comprehensive colleges and universities and liberal arts colleges.

(Insert Table 2 about here)

Career Orientation

The primary professional interests of the two cohorts vary along lines that might be expected in terms of their institutions of employment. Approximately 46% of the TT faculty indicated a primary interest or an interest leaning toward research, while slightly more than 81% of the NTT faculty indicated a primary interest or an interest leaning toward teaching as their principal professional orientation.

Scholarly activity of faculty in the two groups is consistent with their professional interests. While over two-thirds (67.2%) of the NTT faculty indicated they were currently involved in scholarly

work, such activity was reported by over 87% of the TT faculty cohort.

(Insert Table 3 about here)

The two cohorts appear relatively similar on a number of career elements which were included in the study and which are shown in Table 4. Both cohorts view their disciplines and departments as very important to them. However, they tend to differ on the importance of their relationship with undergraduates with a much higher proportion of NTTs citing this factor as very important. They differ as well on the importance of national discipline societies to which a larger proportion of TT faculty attribute a high or fairly high level of importance.

(Insert Table 4 about here)

The Work Environment

The majority of both cohorts of faculty felt that their institution was a very good or fairly good place for them (TT - 85.2%; NTT - 81.9%). When asked to assess their ability to influence department policies the two groups differed in their responses. About 67 percent of the TT faculty felt they had a great deal or quite a bit of opportunity as compared to only 52.5 percent of the NTTs who expressed that opinion. Very few of the TT (14.3%) or the NTT (10.5%) felt that they had a great deal/or quite a lot of opportunity to influence institutional policies.

The two groups were generally similar on their assessments of the intellectual environment and the sense of community at their

institutions. NTT faculty provided generally negative assessments (combined fair and poor) of 60.2% and 61.3% respectively on these two items. These assessments differed very little from those provided by the TT faculty.

Careers

How do the NTT faculty feel about their careers? Slightly in excess of 41 percent of the NTTs indicated that they had given serious consideration to leaving academe in the past two years. For the TT faculty such serious consideration was reported by 31.8 percent. The two groups were similar in the degree to which they strongly agreed that their jobs were a source of strain (NTT 17.5%: TT 19.0%), although when the respondents who "agreed with reservations" to the statement are included, the proportion of TT faculty is greater than the NTT faculty reporting the same feelings. Approximately 50 percent of each group (NTT 49.2%; TT 54.1%) strongly agreed, or agreed with reservations that they tend to subordinate all aspects of their lives to their work.

Slightly in excess of 25 percent of the NTT faculty strongly agreed (9.9%) or agreed with reservations (15.4%) that this is a poor time for a young person to begin an academic career. Nearly twenty percent (19.9%) of the TT faculty had the same reaction with 7.3% strongly agreeing and 12.6% agreeing with reservations. Among the NTT faculty, 17.5% either strongly agreed (7.1%), or agreed with reservations (10.4%) that if they had it to do over again they would not become a college teacher. Among the TT faculty 15.2 %

either strongly agreed (6.3%), or agreed with reservation (8.9%) to the same statement. Nearly 38% of the NTT faculty strongly agreed (14.8%), or agreed with reservations (23.0%) to the statement, "I am considering entering another line of work because prospects for academic advancement seem limited now." On this variable they differ substantially from TT faculty for whom the strongly agree and agree with reservations percentages were 6.3 and 13.9 respectively.

The disaffection with academe that can be inferred for NTT faculty from these reactions is confirmed to a degree when nearly 20% strongly agreed, and an additional 35.7 % agreed with reservations, that they may leave the profession in the next five years. They differed considerably from TT faculty on this variable in that 11% of the TT faculty strongly agreed with the statement and 26% agreed with reservations.

In reviewing their decision to enter the professoriate, 23% of NTT faculty agreed strongly or agreed with reservations that they often wish they had entered another profession. On this point, only 16% of their TT colleagues expressed the same opinions. NTT faculty also differed from TT faculty on two other factors related to career satisfaction. NTT faculty were more likely than TT faculty to express feelings of being trapped in a profession with limited opportunities for advancement (32.8% vs 18.8%), and were more likely to disagree strongly or disagree with reservations to the statement, "I am more enthusiastic about my work than when I began my academic career" (37.7% vs 29.2%).

Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression was used to analyze the variance between untenured tenure-track (TT) and non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty (group membership) as well as describe the relationship between group membership and potential predictor variables. There were two research questions for this statistical procedure:

1. Is there a difference in group membership (TT vs NTT) based on selected independent variables?
2. Is there a relationship between group membership and a set of selected independent variables?

Table 5 reports the results of stepwise regression analysis run on 10 of the 27 variables of interest. These ten variables were found to be significant through direct and stepwise regression. The means of the other 17 variables failed to be statistically significant at the .05 level.

(insert Table 5 about here)

Columns 1 and 2 provide the multiple correlations and R squares (which yield the % of variance explained) for each step. A multiple correlation of .4221 was obtained between the criterion measure, group membership (TT vs NTT), and the 10 possible predictors. This indicates that approximately 18% of the variation in group membership is accounted for by the predictors.

Columns 3 and 4 affirm that there is a significant difference between our population means as each variable is entered. Columns 5 and 6 reaffirm the variance in group membership by reporting that the change in R squared from one variable to the next is

statistically significant.

The analysis of variance via regression indicates that the population means of the untenured but tenure-track faculty is not equal to the population means of the non-tenure-track faculty as defined by the independent variables in the study. Also, the multiple correlations indicate that there is a significant relationship between group membership and the selected independent variables..

The ten variables listed in Table 5 demonstrate that TT and NTT faculty differ significantly on a number of notable dimensions. Many of these factors, such as primary professional interest, prospects for career advancement, and current engagement in scholarly work, show NTT faculty are in a less favorable position than are TT faculty given the values and expectations currently dominant within higher education.

Discriminant Analysis

Discriminant analysis was used to check the difference in group membership (similar to analysis of variance via regression) and to determine the accuracy of group prediction based on the selected variables. The research questions for this procedure were:

1. Is there a difference in group membership (TT vs NTT) based on selected independent variables?
2. How accurately can we predict group membership based on the selected independent variables?

The chi-square test of significance utilized in discriminant

analysis confirms that the non-tenure-track (NTT) cohort differed significantly from the tenure-track (TT) cohort.

Direct and step-wise discriminant analysis was also run on the twenty-seven chosen variables. Fifteen of the variables were identified as significant with the top 10 being identical to those identified through regression.

(insert Table 6 here)

A discriminant analysis of the top 10 variables yielded a chi-square of 171.14 which is significant at the .05 level; therefore, there is a significant difference in group membership. Columns 1 and 2 in Table 6 report the Wilk's Lambda and its significance for the ten significant predictor variables. As the analysis progresses from step 1 to step 10 the Wilk's, lambda decreases, indicating greater statistically significant variance in group membership with each step.

Table 7 reports the classification results based on discriminant analysis using the 10 predictor variables. Nearly 73 percent (72.91%) of the known cases would have been correctly classified or assigned to group 1 (TT faculty) or group 2 (NTT faculty). Furthermore, the ten variables seem to predict more accurately into group 1 than into group 2; 74.3%, or almost 3/4th of the known TT cases were classified correctly while 66.7%, or 2/3rds of the NTT cases were classified correctly.

(Insert Table 7 about here)

The accuracy of overall prediction or classification with the ten variables was 72.91%; with 15 variables it was 74.38% and with

the 27 variables it was 73.69% . The differences between predicting with 10 or 27 variables is less than 1% while the differences between 10 and 15 variables is less than 1.5%. Thus, the benefit of including more than 10 variables in our discussion seems minimal. It is for this reason that the 5 variables identified as significant through discriminant analysis yet not significant in regression were not discussed.

The results of the discriminant analysis produce findings remarkably consistent with the results of the regression analysis. Both procedures indicate that TT and NTT faculty differ in significant ways. Still the factors that distinguish between the two groups are not totally clear and deserve more in-depth investigation.

The Top Ten Variables

The stepwise statistical procedures of multiple regression and discriminant analysis identified the same ten significant predictor variables; yet, the order of entry was altered slightly by the two processes.

Of the seven career orientation variables described at the beginning of the paper, two were among the top ten. An untenured faculty member's primary professional interest was the first variable entered in both multiple regression (MR) and discriminant analysis (DA). The second career orientation variable--whether an untenured faculty member was currently engaged in scholarly work--entered either 9th or 10th.

Of the ten career satisfaction variables mentioned earlier, three captured significant positions. The sense that prospects for academic advancement were limited and thus, professors were considering leaving, grasped the number two entry position in both procedures. Job strain was either 5th or 6th and whether or not an untenured faculty member would become a college teacher again was the 10th or the 8th variable entered into the prediction equation.

Age and gender were discriminating demographic variables for group membership (TT v NTT), yet institution type remained insignificant. Age was entered third during multiple regression and fourth during discriminant analysis. Gender was the seventh variable during both procedures.

Only one of the five work environment variables already described made it into the top ten predictor variables. That variable is the faculty member's perception of his or her opportunity to influence their own department. This variable went into the prediction equation either fourth or third.

Two variables not described previously made it into the top ten predictors list. They are the number of professional writings published or accepted for publication in the last two years (entered 6th or 5th, respectively) and whether or not a faculty member sees teaching effectiveness as a primary criterion for promotion (entered 8th or 9th). About half of the tenure-track faculty agree with the teacher effectiveness comment and slightly over three quarters of the non-tenure-track faculty agree.

As expected TT faculty have had more articles published or

accepted in the last two years (53%) than their NTT colleagues (29%). In fact, 62.9% of the NTT faculty have not published or had anything accepted for publication, while only 26.6% of the TT faculty have remained unpublished in the last two years.

Summary and Discussion

The study's findings suggest that academic life without tenure is characterized by stress and uncertainty for faculty in general. For example, both NTT and TT faculty expressed dissatisfaction with their peripheral roles in academic governance. Both groups also indicated that their jobs superseded all other aspects of their lives and were a source of considerable strain. Higher education institutions must be cognizant of the variety of forces that make the early faculty career a challenging time.

Noteworthy differences between non-tenure-track and untenured but tenure-track faculty emerge from the findings as well. Non-tenure-track professors, as a whole, are older and appear to be less mobile professionally than their tenure eligible colleagues. Non-tenure-track faculty are more teaching-oriented and are also more likely to be employed at primarily teaching-oriented institutions than are their tenure-track counterparts. Consistent with this trend, the findings indicate that NTT faculty are less actively involved in scholarship than are their colleagues working toward tenure. Still, many NTT faculty attempt to maintain a research agenda. Not surprisingly perhaps, women comprise a greater percentage of non-tenure-track faculty than of tenure-track

faculty. The interrupted career patterns common among many women and other factors that inhibit women's career development may account for this difference.

Perhaps most important, non-tenure-track faculty expressed less optimism about their prospects for future career advancement in higher education than did tenure-track professors. Members of the former group were also more likely to consider career options outside of higher education. This finding may represent an accurate grasp of reality on the part of the non-tenure-track respondents. But it also suggests that faculty staffing will be even more difficult if many instructors not on the tenure-track decide to leave for more promising career opportunities outside academe.

The bulk of the evidence shows that non-tenure-track faculty occupy a disadvantaged position in higher education. This study documents their peripheral status and identifies a variety of negative conditions they routinely encounter. The findings suggest that higher education institutions should give more attention and support to non-tenure-track faculty if they want them to function effectively. Colleges also need to give more support to non-tenure-track professors if they wish to keep them within the academic profession.

As a secondary analysis of a general faculty study, this research project raises many additional questions about non-tenure-track faculty that still need to be explored. As we indicated at the outset of the paper, we did not include faculty at two-year institutions in this preliminary analysis; they provide another

segment of the professoriate that requires study.

Questions for Future Research

Based on the results of this exploratory study, we have identified the following questions as potential avenues for further inquiry.

1. How does the NTT experience differ by gender, discipline, and type of institution?
2. Are NTT faculty inherently/fundamentally different from TT faculty or do environmental circumstances (institutional and cultural factors, etc.) account for their differences?

Is the dominant professional orientation of faculty a function of their institutional environment or inherent professional preferences?

3. What is the long term career path of people who start an academic career off the tenure-track?
4. What are the educational/professional histories of TT and NTT faculty? Do their educational backgrounds, employment experience, or professional networks differ in any notable way?
5. What factors account for the larger proportion of women in NTT positions than in TT positions?
6. What factors inhibit the scholarly work of NTT faculty?

These are just a few of the potential areas of further inquiry regarding non-tenure-track faculty. It is evident from these

questions that the interplay between institutional variables and personal and professional factors must be included in further study if we are to develop a better understanding of NTT personnel. We also need to develop an understanding of the number and the attitudes of NTT faculty who are not interested in securing tenure-track positions. More systematic quantitative and qualitative studies of non-tenure-track faculty are necessary if higher education is to adequately nurture and support this increasingly important group.

REFERENCES

Academe, v. 74 (July-August 1986): 14a-19a.

Astin, Alexander W., Korn, William S., and Dey, Eric L. The American College Teacher. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA, 1991.

Baldwin, Roger G. "Faculty Career Stages and Implications for Professional Development." In J.H. Schuster, D.W. Wheeler and Associates. Enhancing Faculty Careers: Strategies for Development and Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Baldwin, Roger G., and Blackburn, Robert T. "The Academic Career as a Developmental Process: Implications for Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education v. 52, n. 6 (1981) 598-614.

Bowen, Howard R., and Schuster, Jack H. American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Bowen, William G., and Sosa, Julie Ann. Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The Condition of the Professoriate: Attitudes and Trends, 1989. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989.

El-Khawas, Elaine. Campus Trends, 1989. Higher Education Panel Report Number 73. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989.

Finkelstein, Martin J. The American Academic Profession: A Synthesis of Social Scientific Inquiry Since World War II. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984.

Hall, Douglas T. Careers in Organizations. Pacific Palisades, Calif: Goodyear, 1976.

Hall, Douglas T., and Nougaim, K. "An Examination of Maslow's Need Hierarchy in an Organizational Setting." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, v. 3 (1968), 12-35.

Light, D.W., Jr., Marsden, L.R., and Corl, T.C. The Impact of the Academic Revolution on Faculty Careers. AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 10. Washington, D.C.:

American Association for Higher Education, 1972.

Lynton, Ernest, and Elman, Sandra. New Priorities for the University. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

National Center for Education Statistics. Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1990.

Super, Donald E. "Self-Realization in Work and Leisure." In D.T. Hall and Associates, Career Development in Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.

Table 1: Variables Utilized in the Study

-
- ** Age
 - ** Gender
 - Type of institution where employed
 - ** Professional interest, teaching vs research
 - ** Current engagement in scholarly work
 - ** Number of professional writings published/accepted past 2 years
 - ** Believe teaching effectiveness should be primary criterion for tenure
 - Abolition of tenure would improve quality of higher education
 - Importance of relationship with undergraduates
 - * Importance of the department
 - Importance of the institution
 - Importance of the academic discipline
 - * Importance of national societies of the teaching discipline
 - Feelings of personal influence in the institution
 - ** Feelings of opportunity to influence own department
 - How the faculty members feels about the institution of employment
 - Rating of sense of community at institution of employment
 - * Feel trapped in the profession, see limited opportunity for advancement.
 - * Feel more enthusiastic than when I began career
 - * Tend to subordinate life to work
 - ** Would not become a college teacher if had it to do over again
 - This is a poor time for a young person to begin academic career
 - Have considered permanent departure from academia in past two years
 - ** Prospects for advancement limited now-considering leaving
 - Often wish I had entered another profession
 - ** Current job is source of considerable personal strain
 - Considered leaving the profession in next five years

** Items found to be significant at the .05 level in the regression analysis

* Additional items found to be significant with discriminant analysis but not in regression

Table 2. Characteristics of the Sample Population

	Tenure-Track	Non-Tenure-Track
Number of faculty	832	183
Mean Age	41.1	43.2
Gender		
Male	64.3%	49.2%
Female	35.7%	50.8%
Type of Institution Where Employed		
Research University	22.8%	16.4%
Doctorate/Granting University	26.1%	19.6%
Comprehensive College/University	25.2%	30.6%
Liberal Arts College	25.8%	33.3%

Table 3. Academic Interests and Responsibilities

Variable	Tenure-Track	Non-Tenure-Track
Primary Professional Interest		
Primary interest in research	8.5%	4.9%
In both, lean toward research	37.7%	13.7%
In both, lean toward teaching	34.3%	31.7%
Primary interest in teaching	19.6%	49.7%
Currently Involved in Scholarly work		
Yes	87.5%	67.2%
No	12.5%	32.8%

Table 4. Importance of Career Elements/Variables

Variable	Tenure-Track	Non-Tenure-Track
<u>Discipline</u>		
Very important	78.4%	73.2%
Fairly important	19.6%	24.6%
Fairly unimportant	1.6%	2.2%
Not at all important	.5%	.0%
<u>Department</u>		
Very Important	47.2%	45.9%
Fairly important	43.8%	39.9%
Fairly unimportant	7.5%	12.6%
Not at all important	1.4%	1.6%
<u>Institution</u>		
Very Important	30.5%	33.3%
Fairly important	49.3%	49.7%
Fairly unimportant	17.4%	13.1%
Not at all important	2.8%	3.8%
<u>Relationship with Undergraduates</u>		
Very important	53.7%	70.0%
Fairly important	38.6%	26.7%
Fairly unimportant	6.7%	2.2%
Not at all important	1.1%	1.1%
<u>National Discipline Societies</u>		
Very important	20.3%	17.5%
Fairly important	47.9%	33.9%
Fairly unimportant	25.5%	36.0%
Not at all important	6.3%	12.0%

TABLE 5
Results of Stepwise Regression Analysis

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Top 10 Variables (Predictor)	MR	R ²	F	Sig F	R ² cha	SigCh
1. primary professional interest (research- teaching)	.2550	.0650	65.68	.000	.0650	.000
2. prospects for academic advancement limited now-considering leaving	.3168	.1004	52.59	.000	.0353	.000
3. age	.3483	.1213	43.36	.000	.0210	.000
4. opportunity to influence own department	.3728	.1390	37.98	.000	.0177	.000
5. current job is source of considerable personal strain	.3865	.1494	33.02	.000	.0104	.001
6. number of professional writings published in past 2 years	.3988	.1590	29.59	.000	.0096	.001
7. gender	.4074	.1660	26.67	.000	.0070	.005
8. see teaching effectiveness as primary criterion for faculty promotion	.4136	.1711	24.17	.000	.0051	.017
9. currently engaged in scholarly work	.4180	.1747	22.02	.000	.0036	.043
10. would not become a college teacher if had choice to do over	.4221	.1781	20.27	.000	.0034	.048

TABLE 6
Results of Discriminant Analysis

	1	2
Top 10 Variables (Predictor)	Wilks	Signif
1. primary professional interest (research-teaching)	.9348	.0000
2. prospects for academic advancement limited now- considering leaving	.8979	.0000
3. opportunity to influence own department	.8808	.0000
4. age	.8644	.0000
5. number of professional writings published in past 2 years	.8533	.0000
6. current job is source of considerable personal strain	.8445	.0000
7. gender	.8386	.0000
8. would not become a college teacher if had choice to do over	.8344	.0000
9. see teaching effectiveness as primary criterion for faculty promotion	.8300	.0000
10. currently engaged in scholarly work	.8263	.0000

Table 7: Classification of Group Membership
by Use of Ten Variables

Actual Group	Number of Cases	Predicted Group Membership	
		1	2
1. Tenure-Track	832	618 74.3%	214 25.7%
2. Non-Tenure-Track	183	61 33.3%	122 66.7%

Percent of cases correctly classified: 72.91%